

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 1, 3-7 and 8 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 8 was withdrawn from consideration in view of the Response to Restriction Requirement filed May 4, 2005. Claim 22 was further withdrawn from consideration as being dependent on non-elected method Claim 8.¹

To summarize the Office Action, claims 1, 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Peiffer. However, the Examiner objects to claims 3, 5, 6 and 21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicates that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The outstanding rejections and objections are traversed, as discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

With respect to claim 1, which the Examiner rejects under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pfeiffer, Applicant notes that claim 1 is amended to incorporate all the features of dependent claim 21, which the Examiner has objected to solely for being dependent from a rejected base claim.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable *at least* by virtue of reciting the features of claim 21, *inter alia*, the coating apparatus further comprises a backup member

¹ As discussed below, the subject matter of dependent claim 22 is incorporated into withdrawn claim 8, and rejoinder of method claim 8 is therefore requested.

supporting the primary bar and the secondary bar from below, and the between-bars liquid reservoir is formed as a space defined by the primary bar, the secondary bar, and the backup member, in combination with other features recited by claim 1. Claim 21 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is therefore requested.

As to dependent claims 3-7, Applicant submits that these claims should be allowed at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein.

With respect to method claim 8, Applicant notes that this withdrawn claim is presently amended to add the subject matter of claim 22, which recites features analogous to the features of dependent claim 21 which were added to the apparatus of claim 1.² Applicant again requests that the Examiner rejoin the withdrawn method claim, which should be allowable for reasons analogous to apparatus claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

² Claim 22 is likewise cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian K. Shelton
Registration No. 50,245

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: **February 20, 2007**